

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,150	50 09/27/2004		Sung-Jin Kim	AP036-04	5035
29689	7590	02/27/2006		EXAMINER	
DAVID A.			CLARK, AMY LYNN		
317 - 649 MARSH ROAD N.E CALGARY, AB T2E 5B4				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CANADA				1655	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u> </u>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office A 4' Occurrence	10/509,150	KIM, SUNG-JIN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Amy L. Clark	1655			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 Fee 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-47 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-8 and 48-83 are subject to restriction Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access	n and/or election requirement. r.	≅xaminer.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/509,150

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-8 and 48-74, drawn to a composition for protecting brain cells or improving memory, said composition comprising an extract of Liriopsis tuber and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

Group II, claim 75, drawn to a method for protecting brain cells against damage caused by excitory amino acids and oxidative stress.

Group III, claim 76, drawn to a method for inhibiting AMPA-induced depolarization of a neuronal cell of a mammal.

Group IV, claim(s) 77-79, drawn to a method of facilitating tyrosine phosphorylation of a hippocampal protein of a mammal.

Group V, claim(s) 80, drawn to a method of inhibiting cholinesterase activity in the brain of a mammal.

Group VI, claim(s) 81, drawn to a method of treating neurogenerative diseases of a mammal.

Group VII, claim(s) 82, drawn to a method of preventing or treating dementia of a mammal.

Group VIII, claim(s) 83, drawn to a method of improving memory of a mammal.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Page 3

Art Unit: 1655

Claims 1 and 3, at least, is anticipated by or obvious over Zhou (US Patent Number 6,416,806 B1; 07/2002). For instance, Claim 1 is drawn to a composition for protecting brain cells or improving memory, said composition comprising of an extract of Liriopsis tuber and a pharmaceutically carrier. Zhou teaches a caffeine replacement composition comprising of Liriopsis (See column 3, lines 60-64 and column 4, line 6 and Claim 28), sugar (See column 4, lines 38-41) or sugar alcohol, such as erythritol or dextrose (See column 6, Example 3), and gingko biloba (See Abstract and column 1, lines 51-56). Zhou further teaches that gingko biloba is known to provide improved memory and cerebral circulation (See column 2, lines 26-27). Zhou does not expressly teach a composition for protecting brain cells or improving memory, gingko biloba inherently improves memory, as clearly taught by Zhou. Zhou also does not expressly teach an extract of Liriopsis obtained by extraction with ethanol. However, it should be noted that Claim 3 constitutes a Product-by-Process type claims. In Product-by-Process type claims, the process of producing the product is given no patentable weight since it does not impart novelty to a product when the product is taught by the prior art. See In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983) and In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972). Consequently, even if a particular process used to prepare a product is novel and unobvious over the prior art, the product per se, even when limited to the particular process, is unpatentable over the same product taught in by the prior art. See In re King, 107 F.2d 618, 620, 43 USPQ 400, 402 (CCPA 1939); In re Merz, 97 F.2d 599, 601, 38 USPQ 143-145 (CCPA 1938); In re Bergy, 563 F.2d 1031, 1035, 195 USPQ 344, 348 (CCPA 1977) vacated 438 US

902 (1978); and *United States v. Ciba-Geigy Corp.*, 508 F. Supp. 1157, 1171, 211 USPQ 529, 543 (DNJ 1979). Finally, since the Patent Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing Applicant's composition with the compositions of the prior art reference, the burden is upon Applicant to show a distinction between the material, structural and functional characteristics of the claimed composition and the composition of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, the composition as taught by Zhou is one in the same as the composition claimed by Applicant. Consequently, the special technical feature which links the claims does not

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

provide a contribution over the prior art, so unity of the invention is lacking.

The species are as follows:

Group I:

Specie A: elect a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier from claim 1.

Specie B: elect a solvent from claim 3.

Specie C: elect an additive from claim 7.

Specie D: elect an administration form from claim 8.

Group II:

Specie A: elect a route of administration from claim 75.

Group III:

Specie A: elect a route of administration from claim 76.

Art Unit: 1655

Group IV:

Specie A: elect a route of administration from claim 77.

Group V:

Specie A: elect a route of administration from claim 80.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: none of the claims are generic.

The species listed above do not relate to a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding technical feature for the following reasons: The prior art suggests a composition for improving memory comprising of comprising of Liriopsis and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

Art Unit: 1655

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

* Applicant is advised that the <u>cited</u> U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, <u>all</u> U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site (<u>www.uspto.gov</u>), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Should you receive inquiries about the use of the Office's PAIR system, applicants may be referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html or 1-866-217-9197.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy L. Clark whose telephone number is (571) 272-1310. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amy L. Clark AU 1655

Amy L. Clark February 16, 2006

> MICHELE FLOOD PRIMARY EXAMINER